

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-7 are pending. By this Amendment, Claims 1-2 are amended and Claims 6-7 added. Since support for the amendments and newly recited subject matter is presented in the application as originally filed, Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is presented.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 essentially reverses the order of the mounting and marking steps recited therein to more closely correspond with that which is discussed in the detailed description portion of the application as originally filed.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,852,248 to Anderson. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reason(s).

Claim 1 recites a process for mounting a plurality of parts to a cable including, among other features or steps, marking the cable with information for mounting each of the parts, the information including mounted positions of each of the parts on the cable, and mounting the parts at the mounted positions marked on the cable.

Contrary to that which is asserted by the Office Action, Anderson fails to disclose or suggest such a feature or features.

Applicant respectfully submits that Anderson is totally silent as to marking the cable with information for each of the parts and merely teaches markings that assist an operator with correctly orienting the cable. The Office Action asserts that

Anderson teaches "marking the cable with information comprises a name, the mounted position and the mounted attitude of each of the parts (See Col. 7, lines 15-18) for mounting of each of the parts before the mounting of the parts (Col. 6, lines 26-30)." as if the cited passages of Anderson correspond to the feature recited by Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits the Office Action mischaracterizes that which is specifically taught by Anderson. In particular, Applicant notes that column 7, lines 15-18 of Anderson specifically teaches that "[t]he cable also has a first conductor marking 610 thereon so that the operator can orient the cable correctly during the manufacture of the harness." As for column 6, lines 26-30, Applicant notes that Anderson again specifically states that "[t]he cable can have a mark to indicate the number 1 conductor in order that the operator of the system described herein can correctly orientate the cable relative to the connectors during the harness manufacturing process."

While Applicant concedes Examiners are to be granted a reasonably broad interpretation as to recited claim features in relation to teachings of applied references, Applicant respectfully submits that the marking on the cable of Anderson for orienting the cable does not, no matter how broadly the interpretation of Anderson's teachings are to be stretched, correspond with the features of Claim 1 wherein the markings are the mounted positions for each of the parts that are mounted on the cable, which is not even remotely similar to marking a cable so that one may orient the cable.

Also, Applicant respectfully submits that Anderson does not disclose a feature wherein the parts are mounted at mounted positions marked on the cable as is recited by Claim 1.

Further, even if somehow a coherent rebuttal to the above presented arguments is presented that the marking taught by Anderson corresponds to the mounted position marked on the cable for each part mounted on the cable, Applicant respectfully points out that the "marking" in Anderson is not intermediate opposing longitudinal ends of the cable in a state where the cable is used, but rather is provided over an entire area between the opposing longitudinal ends of the ribbon cable (see reference number 610 in Figure 2A of Anderson).

To qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102, each and every feature recited in a rejected claim must be disclosed by the applied art. Applicant respectfully submits that for at least the above provided reasons, Anderson does not disclose or suggest each and every feature recited by Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 1 is not anticipated by, nor obvious in view of, Anderson.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 should be deemed allowable.

Claims 2-7 depend from Claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons Claim 1 is allowable, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

A. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,347,651 to Inoue et al. (Inoue) in view of Anderson. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reason(s).

Independent Claim 1 is discussed above.

Inoue is cited for disclosing many of the claimed features of the invention with the exception of the mounted positions being intermediate between opposite ends of the cable in a state where the cable is used. The Office Action admits that Inoue does "not disclose the mounted positions being positioned between opposite ends of the cable in a state where the cable is used."

As noted above, Anderson also fails to teach or suggest this feature.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Anderson does not cure the admitted deficiency of Inoue and that claim 1 is not rendered obvious in view of the combined teachings of Inoue and Anderson and should be allowable.

As for Claim 3, Applicant notes the claim recites the step of marking is carried out at a step of cutting the cable into a predetermined length. The Office Action states that Inoue discloses in column 2, lines 33-41, that marking is carried out at a step of cutting the cable into a predetermined length. See page 4, lines 5-6, of the Office Action. However, Inoue discloses in column 2, lines 33-41, that the system for manufacturing connection wires includes the marking unit 8 having a function to select characters and signs, which are specified, as wire connection information and marks them on both end portions of each wire, and a wire cutting/stripping unit 10

having a function to cut the wire at specified positions. See also Fig. 2 of Inoue. The marking unit 8 and cutting/stripping unit 10 shown in Fig. 2 of Inoue illustrate that the step of marking is not carried out at the step of cutting the wire into a predetermined length. In Inoue, the marking of the wire is separated from the step of cutting and stripping the wire by a fixed-length pulling unit 9. Further, as shown in Fig. 4 of Inoue, the marking unit 8 marks the wire at a different time and in a different location in the device than the cutting/stripping unit 10. As such, Inoue fails to disclose or suggest additional features of the invention beyond those acknowledged in the Office Action. Anderson fails to cure the deficiencies in Inoue. Thus, the combination of Inoue and Anderson fails to disclose or suggest the claimed features of the invention recited in Claim 3.

Applicant respectfully submits that for at least the above provided reasons, the asserted combination of Inoue and Anderson does not render the invention recited by Claims 1 or 3 obvious. Accordingly, Claims 1 and 3 are not obvious in view of the asserted Inoue and Anderson combination.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1 and 3 should be deemed allowable.

Claims 2-7 depend from Claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons Claim 1 is allowable, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

B. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Anderson or Inoue/Anderson further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,267,385 to Okamoto et al. (Okamoto). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reason(s).

Anderson and Inoue/Anderson are cited for disclosing many of the claimed elements of the invention with the exception of sliding at least one of the plurality of parts onto the cable and fixing to the cable at mounted positions by an adhesive. Okamoto is cited for curing this deficiency.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and submits that Claims 4-5 recite subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references.

Claims 4-5 depend from Claim 1. As discussed above, Anderson and Inoue, either singly or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the step of marking being carried out at a step of cutting the cable into a predetermined length.

Okamoto also does not disclose or suggest this feature of the invention, and thereby fails to cure the deficiencies in Anderson and Inoue/Anderson with respect to Claim 1.

As such, the combination of Inoue, Anderson and Okamoto does not disclose or suggest the features of the invention as recited in dependent Claims 4-5.

In view of the above, the Applicant respectfully submits that Anderson, Inoue and Okamoto fail to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness for purposes of a rejection of Claims 1-2 and 4-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Accordingly, Claims 1-2 and

4-5 are not rendered obvious in view of Anderson, Inoue and Okamoto, and should be deemed allowable.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, allowance of Claims 1-7, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing docket number 107348.00358.**

Respectfully submitted,  
**ARENT FOX LLP**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Murat Ozgu  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 44,275

**Customer No. 004372**  
ARENT FOX LLP  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20036-5339  
Telephone: (202) 857-6000  
MO/elp